Appl No. 10/013.093 Amdt. Dated February 22, 2008 Repty to Office action of November 22, 2005 Attorney Dacket No. P15062-US1/1005-0612 EUS/JPP08-9042

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Claim Amendments

The Applicant has armended Claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, Claims 1-21 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2.) Double Patenting

The Examiner provisionally rejected Claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-21 of copending Application No. 10/060747. The Applicant respectfully submits that a preliminary amendment canceling claims 1-21 of the copending application and adding new claims 22-34 were filled with the USPTO on January 30, 2002. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-21 are no longer pending in the Examiner-identified-copending application. As a result, the currently pending claims in this application are not the same as those claims pending in the copending application. The Examiner's favorable reconsideration is earnestly requested.

3.) Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hyong in view of Costa-Requena. The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection and has further amended independent Claim 1 to more clearly and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant considers as his invention. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, the Examiner's favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Hyong reference discloses a Spontaneous Enterprise Communications (SEC) system wherein multiple SEC clients (or users) communicate with a centralized SEC server to provide teleconference and other multi-media bridging services. However, unlike the presently claimed invention, all of the SEC clients already know exactly which SEC server to register and communicate with in order to effectuate the

Appl. No. 16/013,093 Amel: Dated February 22, 2005 Reply to Office action of November 22, 2695 Astorney Docket No. P15062-US 1/1005-0012 EUSJJP/05-9042

teleconferencing service (Fig. 5 of Hyong). On the other hand, the present application presently discloses and claims a novel invention wherein any one service provider can be "matched" up with a subscriber requesting such service. Accordingly, in accordance with the teachings of the present invention, a plurality of service users register with the telecommunication network for a particular service. A presence server in the network then receives a registration message from a service provider wherein the registration message further includes <u>service capability information</u> for the service provider. Upon determining that there is a match between the service capability information identified by the service provider and the subscriber service subscribed to by the plurality of service users, the telecommunication network then sends an identity of the service provider from the presence server to those plurality of service users.

The Applicant respectfully submits that Hyong fails to disclose "receiving at a presence server in the network, a registration message from at least one service provider that is a provider of the subscriber service, said registration message including service capability information for the service provider." As further confirmed by the Examiner, nothing in Hyong discloses or anticipates this step of receiving a registration message from a service provider with its service capability information as clearly recited by independently Claim 1. Additionally, the Hyong reference likewise fails to disclose or teach the step of "sending an identity of the service provider from the presence server to the plurality of service users upon the presence server determining that the service capability information provided by said service provider matches said subscriber service subscribed by said plurality of service users."

Lastly, the Examiner incorrectly stated that the Costa-Requena reference disclosed the step of receiving a registration message "including service capability information for the service provider." The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner and further submits that page 326 of the Costa-Requena reference merely states that SIP is a text-based protocol for providing call signaling over IP networks among network entities and that other complementary information can be inserted as SIP payloads for other applications. However, nothing in Costa-Requena discloses or teaches the step of "receiving at a presence server in the network, a registration

Appl. No. 10/013.093 Arnot. Dated February 22, 2006 Reely to Office action of November 22, 2006 Attorney Dockel No. P10062-US1/1006-0012 EUSUPP06-6042

message from at least one service provider that is a provider of the subscriber service, said registration message including service capability information for the service provider." In other words, there is nothing in Costa-Requena that anticipates or render obvious the currently recited step of receiving a registration message from a service provider at a presence server wherein that received registration message further contains service capability information for that service provider.

As a result, the Hyong and the Costa-Requena, individually or in combination, fail to anticipate or render obvious the presently pending claims. A Notice of Allowance for independent Claim 1 and its dependent claims is therefore earnestly requested.

As for the remaining claims, no other rejections were issued by the Examiner. The Applicant nevertheless submits that for at least similar reasons as stated above, all other remaining claims are likewise patentable over the cited references and a Notice of Allowance is further requested. Appi No. 19/013,093 Ameri Dated February 22, 2006 Reply to Office action of November 22, 2005 Attorney Dockel No. P15062-US1/1005-0012 EUSJJP905-6042

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted.

By John C. Han Registration No. 41,403

Date: February 22, 2006

Ericsson Inc. 6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11 Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-7686 john.han@ericsson.com